DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 123 EA 021 796

TITLE	Factoring In Empowerment: Participatory Decisionmaking in West Virginia Exemplary Schools.
INSTITUTION	Appalachia Educational Lab., Charleston, W. Va.; West Virginia Education Association, Charleston.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Jun 89
CONTRACT	400-86-0001
NOTE	47p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications, Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., P.O. Box 1348, Charleston, WV 25325 ($5.00).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Decision Making; Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; Organizational Development; *Participative Decision Making; School Based Management; Teacher Influence; *Teacher Participation; Teamwork
IDENTIFIERS	*Empowerment; *West Virginia

ABSTRACT

Because schools must still respond to federal reporting requirements while exercising greater responsibility for funding and administering local programs that were once under state and federal administration, and because of the increased public outcry for local accountability, many school districts have maintained large central administrative staffs and reduced teaching staffs. Research on effective schools indicates, however, that the most important unit for true change is the individual school. This document examines the relationship between greater recognition for effective schools and increased teacher involvement in the decisions that contribute to that excellence. The West Virginia Education Association and the Appalachian Education Laboratory (WVEA-AEL) surveyed the principals and teachers of the 68 elementary, middle, and secondary schools recognized as exemplary since 1982 by the West Virginia Department of Education. The response rate was approximately 39 percent. Findings from both teachers and principals indicate significantly greater teacher involvement in decisionmaking than commonly reported in the literature. It appears that, in the process of achieving exemplary school status, the faculties of the schools embraced collaborative decisionmaking strategies. The WVEA-AEL survey respondents, the survey, and the percentage of teachers' and principals' responses are appended. The bibliography contains 138 references. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EA

ED318123

Factoring in Empowerment:
Participatory Decisionmaking in West Virginia Exemplary Schools

A Joint Study by the

West Virginia Education Association
1558 Quarrier Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25311

and

Appalachia Educational Laboratory
P. O. Box 1348
Charleston, West Virginia 25325

June 1989

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marilyn Slack

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 021 796

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Factoring in Empowerment:
Participatory Decisionmaking in West Virginia Exemplary Schools

A Joint Study by

WVEA

West Virginia Education Association
Charleston, West Virginia

and

AEL

Appalachia Educational Laboratory
Charleston, West Virginia

June 1989

Funded by the

OERI

Office of Educational Research and Improvement
U. S. Department of Education
Washington, D. C.

The Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL), Inc., works with educators in ongoing R & D-based efforts to improve education and educational opportunity. AEL serves as the Regional Educational Laboratory for Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. It also operates the ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. AEL works to improve:

- professional quality,
- curriculum and instruction,
- community support, and
- opportunity for access to quality education by all children.

Information about AEL projects, programs, and services is available by writing or calling AEL, Post Office Box 1348, Charleston, West Virginia 25325; 800/624-9120 (outside WV), 800/344-6646 (in WV), and 347-0400 (local); 304/347-0487 (FAX number).

This publication is based on work sponsored wholly or in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U. S. Department of Education, under contract number 400-86-0001. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the views of OERI, the Department, or any other agency of the U. S. Government.

These materials are issued in draft form for developmental purposes.

AEL is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements v

Executive Summary vii

Introduction 1
- Planning the Study 1
- Conducting the Study 1

Participatory Decisionmaking: A Vehicle for Exemplary Schools 3

West Virginia Exemplary Schools: Selection Process 7

Findings of the Study 9
- Characteristics of Exemplary Schools 9
- Extent of Use and Value Placed on Participatory Decisionmaking 10
- Use of Participatory Decisionmaking to Determine School Goals, Policies, and Practices 10
- Types of Decisions into Which Teachers Have Input or Desire Input 11
- Availability of Time and Training for Participatory Decisionmaking 12

Degree to Which Teachers Choose to or Have Opportunities to be Involved in School-Based Decisionmaking 13

Obstacles Participants Perceive to Participatory Decisionmaking in their Schools or Obstacles Overcome 14

Comparison of Results From the WVEA-AEL Survey and Results From *Teacher Involvement in Decisionmaking: A State-by-State Profile* 17
- Instructional Materials 17
- Curriculum 17
- Student Behavior 17
- Tracking 18
- Inservice Training 18
- Promotion Policy 18
- Budget 18
- Teacher Evaluation 18
- Teacher Selection 18
- Administrator Selection 19

Conclusion 21

References 23

Bibliography 25

Appendices
- A: Survey Respondents
- B: WVEA-AEL Survey of Educator Perceptions of Decisionmaking: WV Exemplary Schools and Invitation to Participate
- C: Areas of Teacher Involvement in Decisions

Acknowledgements

The West Virginia Education Association (WVEA) and the Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL) wish to thank the following educators, the WVEA-AEL study group on participatory decisionmaking, who developed this publication. Their time and efforts in literature review, survey development, data analysis, and writing and editing are much appreciated. Their statements should inform planners of future participatory decisionmaking groups.

Sarita Beckett, Raleigh County Schools
Nancy Charlton, Nicholas County Schools
Ruth Davis, Kanawha County Schools
Cleo Mathews, Summers County Schools
Mike Pack, Kanawha County Schools
Donald Smith, Jackson County Schools

Also essential to this product were the administrators and teachers of West Virginia exemplary schools who responded to a survey on the extent and types of teacher involvement in decisionmaking in their schools. Without their assistance, there would be no publication. A complete list of these educators with their schools and districts is included as Appendix A.

All projects grow from seeds to their eventual fruition. For a study group product the seed is an idea for a professional development experience for those who conduct the study and those who read the product. Kayetta Meadows, WVEA president, sowed the idea for *Factoring in Empowerment: Participatory Decisionmaking in West Virginia Exemplary Schools* by recommending participatory decisionmaking as a topic of interest to members and to educators throughout AEL's Region. Her assistance in nominating members and arranging the printing, distribution, and collection of the survey greatly aided the work of the study group. John Himelrick, director of the Office for School Improvement of the West Virginia Department of Education, provided the list of principals of all exemplary schools identified since 1982. This list was critical to the group's investigation.

Finally, AEL staff who worked to blend the voices of many into one document, those who researched, edited, rewrote, typed, and typeset the final copy, contributed greatly to the quality of the final product. The authors wish to thank the following AEL staff who worked on this study group product:

Peggy Dent
Mary Farley
Jane Hange
Donna Kirk
Carolyn Luzader
Maryrita Miller

Executive Summary

The baby boom resulted in burgeoning school enrollments during 1955-70 and the need for more teachers. A more active role of the federal government in ensuring equitable education for all students during the 1960s and 1970s resulted in increased administrative tasks at the federal, state, and local levels. The bulge of baby boomers has passed through the schools and the boomers are currently creating a boomlet with their own offspring. However, school districts must continue to respond to federal reporting requirements while exercising greater responsibility for funding and administering local programs which were once under state and federal administration. Perhaps because of this push for reporting upward to state and federal authorities, as well as the increased public outcry for local accountability, many school districts have maintained large central administrative staffs and reduced teaching staffs.

However, research on effective schools indicates that the most important unit for true change is the individual school. The reform movement's focus on the principal as instructional leader brought to light the importance of this individual as a true educator and motivator of others rather than as a skillful administrator. Finally, after the first wave of reform literature which noted deficiencies and relied on business and research arenas to inform educators, especially teachers, of ways to improve practice, the key to change was again realized. Namely, that the involvement in decisionmaking of those individuals closest to the implementation and impact of the decision was essential. Improvements in outcomes, such as decreased dropout rates and higher achievement test scores, could not be realized until teachers were involved in charting the course in their classrooms and in the schools.

Factoring in Empowerment: Participatory Decisionmaking in West Virginia Exemplary Schools examines the relationship between two recent reform results: greater recognition for effective schools and increased teacher involvement in the decisions that contribute to that excellence. Participatory decisionmaking, the involvement in decisionmaking of those implementing and, often, of those affected by decisions, is not a requirement for recognition as a West Virginia exemplary school. Yet, the study group of teachers who developed this publication reasoned, there may be a relationship between such recognition and the extent of involvement of teachers in school-based decisionmaking. They began with a survey of principals and teachers from all elementary, middle, and secondary schools (responses from 38 schools) recognized as exemplary by the West Virginia Department of Education since 1982. The WVEA-AEL study group then analyzed survey responses to determine the extent of teacher involvement in decisionmaking and the types of school policy and practice decisions in which teachers were frequently engaged.

Findings from both teachers and principals indicate significantly greater teacher involvement in decisionmaking than commonly reported in the literature. A comparison of survey data to the findings of a national survey (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1988) indicated that average responses of teachers from the WVEA-AEL study were 25 percentage points higher in reported involvement on all issues queried. Over 60 percent of all teacher respondents reported regular teacher involvement in their schools on 12 of 22 decisional areas. Those 12 areas were: curriculum, scheduling, grouping, teacher duty assignments, student placement, ad hoc committee organiza-

tion, formation of discipline policy, student recognition, instructional materials selection, grading/student evaluation, report card/progress report development, and inservice.

Factoring in Empowerment: Participatory Decisionmaking in West Virginia Exemplary Schools reports not only the types of decisions teachers in these schools have routinely been involved in making, but also the extent of teacher involvement in decisionmaking and the means used to ensure teacher involvement. The reader is provided with background on West Virginia exemplary schools selection, an analysis of the aggregated responses, and a list of respondents. *Factoring in Empowerment: Participatory Decisionmaking in West Virginia Exemplary Schools* can inform those looking for tips to increase teacher involvement in decisionmaking or those seeking a means to improve the effectiveness of their schools.

Help Us Improve This Publication

Readers are requested to complete the product evaluation form included and to fold, staple, stamp, and return it to AEL. Suggestions for revisions to the document and/or other study group products are welcome.

Introduction

The Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL) seeks to provide professional development opportunities to educators by working with and through their associations. Since 1985, one way that the Classroom Instruction (CI) program has assisted associations is through the creation of study groups. AEL's purpose for a study group is to assist educators in conducting and using research.

A study group is composed of educators who are organized to conduct a study on an educational issue and who produce a product that is useful to their colleagues. Associations and AEL jointly select topics for study groups, although the selection of members is handled by the association. AEL staff participate in meetings as members of the study group, but the association or individual members often make in-kind contributions that far exceed AEL's grant. AEL provides additional services, such as editing, layout, and typesetting of the group's final product. The responsibility for dissemination lies with both AEL and the association. Usually, AEL provides dissemination to the other three states in its Region while the association covers distribution of the product in its own state.

Planning the Study

In July 1988 Kayetta Meadows, president of the West Virginia Education Association (WVEA), and Jane Hange, director of AEL's Classroom Instruction program, met to discuss the formation of the fourth WVEA-AEL study group. With the national focus on the empowerment of teachers plus the formation of the Council of Professional Educators—West Virginia's professional standards board composed of a majority of teachers—WVEA viewed the topic of participatory decisionmaking as important to the future of education in the state and selected it the focus for the work of a small group of WVEA members.

At the first meeting of the group of five teachers and one librarian, members determined the focus of their work would be an examination of the extent and types of teacher involvement in school-based decisionmaking in West Virginia's exemplary schools. Study group members decided that a publication exploring the results of a survey of principals and teachers of these schools could guide others in establishing participatory decisionmaking in their schools.

Conducting the Study

A review of the literature on participatory decisionmaking was the initial task of study group members. They read documents provided by AEL and shared perceptions during early meetings to prepare for survey development. Following discussion of characteristics of participatory decisionmaking programs and a narrowing of the survey sample to representatives from WV exemplary schools, members collectively developed the "WVEA-AEL Survey of Educator Perceptions of Decisionmaking in West Virginia Exemplary Schools," included with a cover letter describing the study as Appendix B. The survey's open-ended questions elicited teacher and principal perceptions of the extent of teacher involvement in school goal, policy, and practice decisions. Respondents gave specific examples of areas of decisions in which teachers were involved as decisionmakers. After describing the training provided to facilitate teacher involvement in school decisions, respondents also commented on the obstacles to and benefits from participatory decisionmaking.

The survey was copied and distributed by WVEA to each principal and an experienced teacher (identified by WVEA local association presidents) in each of the 68 schools which have been recognized by the West Virginia Department of Education as exemplary since the program was begun in 1982. One hundred thirty-six (136) surveys were distributed. A followup mailing to the principals and local association presidents who identified and provided surveys to the teachers of the exemplary schools increased the response rate to approximately 39 percent. A total of 52 responded, including administrators (26 principals and two unidentifed administrators) and 24 responses from teachers (see Appendix A for complete list of respondents). Study group members convened to review survey data and to determine the best methods of analyzing and reporting the findings. The final product contains brief background information on participatory decisionmaking and the selection of West Virginia exemplary schools, as well as the findings from survey responses.

Subsections focusing on respondent data include characteristics of the sample schools; areas of teacher involvement in school-based decisionmaking; extent of faculty involvement in decisionmaking; amount of released time and training provided; perceptions of obstacles to effective participatory decisionmaking; the effects of participatory decisionmaking on goals, policies, and practices in the schools; and the perceived benefits of participatory deicisonmaking. The document concludes with a comparison of teacher responses to the WVEA-AEL survey with teacher responses reported in a study conducted for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching entitled *Teacher Involvement in Decisionmaking: A State-by-State Profile* (1988). The discussion highlights levels of teacher perceptions of involvement in school-based decisionmaking among teachers across the nation, in West Virginia, and more particularly in West Virginia exemplary schools. The marked difference between teachers of West Virginia exemplary schools and the other two samples is commented upon in light of current discussions of participatory decisionmaking as a source of teacher empowerment.

Participatory Decisionmaking: A Vehicle for Exemplary Schools

The 1983 National Commission on Excellence in Education described in alarming terms existing ineffectual policies and practices in American schools. In response to their report, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, a flurry of school reform efforts ensued.

From the beginning, the "what" of reform has been clearly defined. Educational research and development has identified specific policies and practices that are effective in achieving excellence in student learning. However, a dramatic change of perspective on the "how" of implementing these policies and practices has evolved. Initially, the traditional, top-down directive to implement prescribed changes in school practices was utilized. Eventually, it became evident that a serious gap existed between the problems and the decisions made to resolve them. Because of the diversity among students, schools, and districts, educators began to see that teachers, who were closest to the problem, were in the best position to determine the most effective solutions to the problem of meeting the unique needs of their students. In discussing the professionalization and empowerment of teachers, the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (1986) recommended that educators "restructure schools to provide a professional environment for teaching, freeing them to decide how best to meet state and local goals for children while holding them accountable for student progress."

In looking for new models of decisionmaking, educators turned to the discipline of business management where various forms of participatory decisionmaking were succeeding in increasing productivity. Participatory decisionmaking is essentially the practice of giving all parties affected by a decision a voice in making the decision (Marburger, 1985). Participation in decisionmaking is voluntary and may be accomplished by majority vote, selection of representatives, advisory councils, or consensus. Participatory decisionmaking is democratic in nature, with participants holding equal decisionmaking status and power, rather than a more authoritarian structure, where participants hold subordinate positions of status and power to the supervisor.

Solutions become more relevant since they are generated at the level at which the problem exists. Additional advantages of using participatory decisionmaking in schools are listed below:

- More comprehensive decisions are made by expanding the range of concerns and perspectives.
- Organizational effectiveness is enhanced when the issues to be resolved are not funneled through a narrow channel of decisionmakers.
- Communication levels are enhanced through active sharing of knowledge and opinions.
- The level of trust and respect among staff members is increased.
- Democratic principles are modeled in day-to-day operations and interactions within the school.
- A sense of ownership of the problem and its solution develops among participants, enhancing implementation.
- The expertise of participants is recognized.
- Morale is enhanced among those implementing the decisions.

- Schooling becomes more meaningful to students.
(Fulbright, 1988; Lindelow, Coursen, & Mazzarella, 1981)

Participatory decisionmaking in schools has traditionally been limited to such practices as textbook and curriculum committees. More recent attempts to incorporate participatory decisionmaking in determining education policies and practice have utilized two types of management systems—school-based management and team management.

School-based management is predicated on the principle that the responsibility and authority for decisions affecting a particular school rest within that school (Mojkowski and Fleming, 1988). Accordingly, custodians would be involved in custodial decisions, principals in building-wide decisions, and teachers in classroom decisions. Parents and community members are usually involved in an advisory capacity.

Team management, another model of participatory decisionmaking, derived from such business management models as Quality Circles (Kelley, 1986), encourages input through a more structured approach. The traditional power structure is maintained, so the final acceptance of team decisions is the responsibility of the principal. Although school-based management systems use teams or committees, team management practices have more established procedures for planning, training, selection, and operation of decisionmaking teams.

In order to use the time and energy of teachers in decisionmaking most effectively, the types of decisions should be chosen selectively, according to what Schneider (1984) calls "zones of acceptance," or areas of involvement in decisionmaking in which teachers would be most willing to participate. Decisions that teachers are most likely to be involved in are those in which they have a high degree of interest and expertise. Decisions that can be predicted to elicit high levels of teacher involvement are:

- assisting with selection of new teachers,
- evaluating teachers' performance,
- helping to establish goals for the school,
- developing and coordinating curriculum across grade levels and within departments,
- establishing student routines and discipline policy,
- designing and conducting inservice education at the school site,
- assigning students and scheduling classes,
- problem-solving schoolwide and developing programs,
- evaluating the effectiveness of departments or units within the school, and
- preparing departmental or unit budgets.
(Schneider, 1984)

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1988) conducted a survey of 20,000 teachers across the United States to determine, after five years of school reform activity, teacher perceptions of their involvement in key decisions that shape classroom and school policy and practice. In the study Ernest L. Boyer concluded that:

> Teachers, we found, are not sufficiently involved in making critical decisions. They have little influence over education procedures. While most teachers help choose textbooks and shape curriculum, the majority do not help select teachers and administrators at their schools, nor are they asked to participate in such crucial matters as teacher evaluation, staff development, budget, student placement, promotion and retention policies, and standards of student conduct. (p. 1)

For *Report Card on School Reform: The Teachers Speak* (1988), the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching surveyed teachers regarding their perceptions of advancements in school reform. The foundation concluded that, overall, teachers are still skeptical

of school reform efforts and dispirited by measures that have left them with more responsibility and less power. Clearly, the hoped-for advantages of participatory decisionmaking have not yet been fully realized. However, the radical changes called for in the school reform movement will necessarily take time, and there are enough reports of success from various schools across the nation to withhold any pronouncements of failure. A summary of the report, *Report Card on School Reform: The Teachers Speak*, (the Source, 1988) concludes with these words: "In the end, the quality of American education can be no greater than the dignity we assign to teaching." Teacher empowerment is a step in that direction.

West Virginia Exemplary Schools— Selection Process

In 1982, the West Virginia Department of Education established the West Virginia Exemplary Schools Program in conjunction with the United States Department of Education School Recognition Program to identify and give public recognition to outstanding public and private schools (West Virginia Department of Education, 1988).

Since the second year of its inception, the West Virginia Exemplary Schools Program selected schools from elementary, middle, and secondary levels. However, until 1984 the United States Department of Education School Recognition Program recognized only secondary schools. As a result, only the middle/secondary West Virginia exemplary schools could be nominated for national recognition. Since 1984 the national program has recognized elementary and middle/secondary schools on alternate years, and the West Virginia program has nominated all West Virginia exemplary schools for national recognition on the year designated for each level. This meant that schools selected on a year not designated for national recognition at their level had to wait until the following year to be nominated to the national program, along with the exemplary schools chosen in that year.

The West Virginia Exemplary Schools Program has now adopted a selection process whereby exemplary schools from either the elementary, middle, or secondary level will be selected on a three-year cycle. This arrangement is in keeping with a proposed plan of the national program and should eventually result in West Virginia exemplary schools at each of the three levels being nominated for national recognition in the same year they are selected.

The process for selection as a West Virginia exemplary school begins with district superintendent nominations of schools meeting prescribed eligibility requirements. The number of schools a superintendent may nominate is proportional to the number of schools at each level within that district.

The selection committee is appointed by the state superintendent of schools and consists of representatives from higher education, district central office administration, and previous exemplary school principals. Selection is based on information provided by nominated schools on the following conditions of effective schooling:

- Leadership,
- Teaching Environment,
- Learning Environment,
- Institutional Vitality,
- Parental and Community Support, and
- Indicators of Success.

There are no specific standards for each of these conditions; instead, the accomplishments of each school are judged according to their stated goals for each of the conditions. They are also judged by the degree to which the programs are tailored to local needs. For the 1988-89 school year extra points were awarded to schools that demonstrated particularly effective geography programs and/or schools that had strengthened curriculum requirements in the last five years.

Upon recommendation of the selection committee, a review team comprised of a representative from the state board of education and an administrator from a former exemplary school conduct an on-site visitation and write a report. The selection committee and the review committee collaborate in nominating schools to the state

superintendent of schools, who makes the final selection.

The earlier selection criteria of the West Virginia Exemplary Schools Program placed more emphasis on performance outcomes related to conditions of effective schools research with little investigation of participatory decisionmaking practices. However, recent nomination forms ask four to five questions in the leadership section that are directly related to the decisionmaking processes and the level of involvement of faculty. In light of research that suggests that participatory decisionmaking has a positive effect on the motivation and involvement of teachers, and consequently, the quality of decisions and their implementation, it is expected that teachers of exemplary schools will report high levels of involvement in participatory decisionmaking.

The next section of this report explores to what extent teachers in West Virginia exemplary schools are in fact involved in decisionmaking. The section focuses on the results of the "WVEA-AEL Survey of Educator Perceptions of Decisionmaking in West Virginia Exemplary Schools."

Findings of the Study

The "WVEA-AEL Survey of Educator Perceptions of Decisionmaking in West Virginia Exemplary Schools" consisted of open-ended items focused on the extent and types of teacher involvement in the formation of school goals, policies, and practices. Respondents were asked to provide examples detailing the number of opportunities for teacher involvement in school decisions and the kinds of decisions routinely made. Study group members determined that across-group (elementary/middle/high school or administrator/teacher responses) analysis would provide information most useful to readers. Study group members clustered survey questions for analysis of frequencies of responses and for commonalities emerging from the data. The following clusters of questions were based upon question similarities:

#1	characteristics of exemplary schools,
#'s 2, 15	extent of use of participatory decisionmaking and value placed on participatory decisionmaking in exemplary schools,
#'s 3, 4, 5	degree to which exemplary school goals, policies, and practices are adopted through participatory decisionmaking,
#'s 6, 7, 8	decisional areas in which teachers have regular input or would like to have input,
#'s 9, 11	availability of time and training for participatory decisionmaking,
#'s 10, 12, 13	degree to which teachers choose to or have opportunity to be involved in school-based decisionmaking, and
#14	obstacles respondents perceive to participatory decisionmaking in their schools or obstacles overcome.

The following subsections discuss the findings within the above clusters.

Characteristics of Exemplary Schools

This first topic examines data gathered in response to the first question from the survey:

1. In your view, why is your school an exemplary school? What characteristics of your school make it exemplary?

When asked the above questions, respondents described factors associated with seven areas: staff, school atmosphere, programs, school administrators, parental involvement, facilities/equipment/technology, and community involvement. Cited most frequently was the importance of a qualified, dedicated, caring, cooperative, innovative team composed of teachers, principal, and professional support personnel. These descriptors of the staff were used by more than half of all respondents.

Tied for second place as most important characteristics of an exemplary school were school atmosphere and programs. A majority of the respondents used words such as student- or child- entered; positive atmosphere; family atmosphere; high expectations; good discipline;

structured; clear goals; innovative programs; program variety; and manageable class size and school enrollment.

The school administrator ranked as the third major contributor toward selection as a West Virginia exemplary school. The positive characteristics most often mentioned were willingness to listen to staff, willingness to accept teacher-developed programs and to assist teachers in developing programs, and the ability to lead staff in improving themselves and the school.

Parental involvement was also reported as central to exemplary schools. Respondents characterized the parents and school community as concerned for academic progress of children. Parents were described as supportive of active parental organizations; school goals and philosophy; and teachers, administrators, and students in attaining school goals.

Extent of Use and Value Placed on Participatory Decisionmaking

Questions 2 and 15 in the "WVEA-AEL Survey of Educator Perceptions of Decisionmaking in West Virginia Exemplary Schools" relate to the frequency of use and the value placed on participatory decisionmaking. Exact wording of the questions is included here for reference:

2. Is teacher participation in decisionmaking an important part of decisions made at your school?

15. Do you believe that participatory decisionmaking is used at your school? Yes or no. If yes, please explain what you believe are the main benefits from your school's participatory decisionmaking.

Nearly all administrator and teacher respondents indicated that participatory decisionmaking is an integral part of day-to-day practices. Respondents most frequently discussed a structure for this involvement known as the School Improvement Team or Coordinating Committee. This team or committee was often described as involved in various aspects of organizing and managing the school plant. Other committees were described as organized to determine scheduling and curriculum, to establish rules and regulations, to develop and implement school policies and regulations, and to enrich instruction.

Respondents who felt that participatory decisionmaking was used at their schools also listed benefits of this practice. Most respondents described unity of the staff as the main benefit. Second in frequency was a heightened sense of professionalism on the part of the staff. Also mentioned numerous times were improved self-esteem among staff, a sense of ownership (belonging), and good working conditions.

Use of Participatory Decisionmaking to Determine School Goals, Policies, and Practices

Questions 3, 4, and 5 in the survey relate to this topic. Exact wording of the questions follows:

3. Do you believe teachers in your school have input (are asked to share their opinions directly or through a faculty representative) into establishing the school goals? Yes or no. If yes, please explain in more detail, citing examples.

4. Do you believe teachers in your school have input into policy revisions or the formulation of new policies (e.g., attendance, student discipline, professional leave, or parental involvement policies)? Yes or no. If yes, please describe any recent decisions regarding policy into which teachers had input.

5. Do you believe teachers have input into day-to-day school practice decisions (e.g., student placement, grouping, or scheduling practices)? Yes or no. If yes, please describe any teacher input into recent practice decisions.

Over 80 percent of respondents felt teachers were asked to share their opinions on each area

listed in the questions above: school goals, policies, and practices. Teacher and administrator respondents described teacher representation on school improvement committees that define school mission and determine goals. Frequently the entire faculties then voted on approving or modifying the goals. Some respondents reported meeting during the school year to determine progress toward goals.

The teachers and administrators reported that in some of the exemplary schools, faculties meet during each school year to set and to evaluate the effectiveness of policies and to modify these when necessary. Some respondents described districtwide committees with teacher representation which established policies.

Teacher respondents reported that they feel they are instrumental to the scheduling process, student referrals, and to other decisions made at the school level. In some of the exemplary schools, teachers meet at the end of each school year to group students for the next year.

Types of Decisions into Which Teachers Have Input or Desire Input

Questions 6, 7, and 8 in the WVEA-AEL survey responded in varying degrees to this area of concern.

6. Please check any area listed in which you believe teachers make decisions or have regular input into decisions at your school. (See Appendix B for specific areas of teacher input.)

Fifty percent or more of each responding group (teachers and administrators) checked the following areas: curriculum, scheduling, grouping of students, teacher duty assignments, student placement, ad hoc committee formation, ad hoc committee member selection, discipline policy formation, student recognition, instructional materials selection, report card/progress report development, and inservice training (see text of question and percentages of responses provided as Appendix C). While the list of 22 decisional areas on the survey is not exhaustive of school decisions, teachers and principals in the exemplary schools agree that teachers are involved in over 50 percent of the major decisions.

The greatest discrepancies between teacher and administrator responses appear in two areas, extracurricular responsibilities (coaching, club advisement, etc., and grading/student evaluation). Concerning extracurricular responsibilities, 69 percent of the principals felt teachers were involved in decisions but only 20 percent of the teachers reported involvement. In grading and student evaluation, 92 percent of the administrators felt that teachers had regular input, yet only 68 percent of the teachers reported involvement. Teacher involvement in decisions as perceived by administrators was greater than what teachers reported for all 22 categories except teacher duty assignments, released time use, department chairperson/team leader/grade representative selection, and inservice training. While the numbers of total administrators and total teachers responding were comparable (24 teachers and 28 administrators) the small number of respondents for any particular level—elementary, middle, or high school—make comparisons among or within levels inconclusive.

7. In what areas not mentioned in items 3, 4, 5, and 6 (above) would teachers in your school like to have input or involvement in decisionmaking?

When asked this question, teacher respondents cited numerous areas. Academic testing programs that influence student retention and promotion decisions, school calendar, school consolidation, school handbook and newsletters, school/business partnership programs, school maintenance, and evaluation of the principal were listed. Several administrator and teacher respondents stated that teachers would prefer to have greater involvement in these areas previously listed: scheduling, duty assignments, school budget allocations, staff selection, discipline policy setting, textbook selection, teacher evaluation, inservice training, and job description formation.

8. Do you believe teachers have adequate input into decisions made at your school?

Five of the 52 teachers and administrators responded negatively to this question. The majority of respondents from both groups, however, felt teachers had adequate involvement in decisionmaking. Several teachers and administrators felt that this involvement should be extended to more decisions and to more teachers within the district. Several also said they would like to see more teachers participate in current decisionmaking opportunities.

Availability of Time and Training for Participatory Decisionmaking

This concern was addressed by questions 9 and 11 in the survey. Following each question is a description of respondent data.

9. Is there time during the school day for mutual planning by departments, grade levels, or ad hoc committees of educators? Yes or no. If yes, please describe any specific examples.

Perceptions of time available during the school day for mutual planning by department, grade levels representatives, or ad hoc committees vary among grade levels. Mutual planning time appears to be more common at the middle school and elementary school levels. A majority of high school teachers and administrators reported that mutual planning time is not provided at their schools. Perceptions of the provision of mutual planning time vary between teachers and administrators at the same level, with more administrators reporting the provision of this resource for teacher involvement in instructional and school-based decisionmaking.

Approximately 56 percent of respondents described some mutual planning time for some teacher groups (departments, grade levels, and/or committees) during the school day. While many respondents in this group cited daily mutual planning time, frequency of the provision of planning time ranged from early dismissals four times per school year to daily grade level planning periods and additional released time for committee meetings. Where cited, the amount of time provided for mutual planning ranged from 20 to 40 minutes. Many respondents who described no provision of mutual planning time during the school day discussed committee and grade level meetings held before or after the school day.

The data indicated that mutual planning time during the school day is inherent in the team approach used in exemplary middle schools. Mutual planning time for elementary teachers was reported as tacked on to the beginning or end of the day. High school teacher and administrator respondents described some provision of mutual planning time during the school day.

11. Has district or school-based training been offered for faculty in any of the following areas? Please check any and all that apply. (See Appendix B for specific areas of faculty training.)

Teachers and administrators at all education levels reported school climate improvement and data collection/needs assessment as the most common training areas, followed by communications and school leadership. Mentioned by five or fewer respondents as topics of training in their schools were participatory decisionmaking, consensus reaching, conflict resolution, and trust building.

High school teachers and administrators were less likely to have opportunities for all types of training listed compared to their elementary and middle school colleagues. The highest number of teachers checking a listed training topic were the nine elementary teachers who responded that teachers at their schools had been offered training in school climate improvement. Elementary administrators who cited climate training and data collection/needs assessment training (12 each) represented the greatest number of all respondents who checked training opportunities. These data may lead to the conclusion that less than 50 percent of these exemplary school educators were offered faculty

training opportunities in skills related to school-based decisionmaking. Four other topics of training offered according to administrator responses were high expectations, equity in achievement, Assertive Discipline, and effective schools research. Teachers suggested no other areas of training offered.

Degree to Which Teachers Choose to or Have Opportunities to be Involved in School-Based Decisionmaking

Questions 10, 12, and 13 in the survey deal with this topic. The questions are listed individually below and precede a discussion of respondent data.

10. About what percent of the teachers in your school volunteer to serve on school committees?

Percentages provided were averaged so they could be compared across educational levels. Discrepancies existed between administrator and teacher estimates of the percentage of volunteers. Of the three school levels represented, elementary administrators and teachers reported the greatest success in recruiting volunteers to serve on committees. Elementary administrators reported that 86 percent of their staff offer to participate as committee members, while elementary teachers stated that 57 percent of their colleagues volunteer.

The average volunteerism rate according to middle school administrators was 70 percent, while middle school teachers—on the average—felt that 41 percent of their colleagues volunteered for committee work. High school administrators and teachers reported low, yet comparable, levels of volunteerism in their schools. The administrators estimated volunteers represented about 49 percent of the faculty, while teachers reported a volunteerism rate of approximately 45 percent.

Many respondents described freedom to decline participation, to switch to other committees, or to share committee responsibilities. Both administrator and teacher respondents described the importance of balancing professional and personal obligations, a factor that can depress volunteerism. Percentages of volunteerism ranged from 5 percent to 100 percent. However, as one elementary principal who reported 100 percent volunteerism stated, "There are so many committees and activities that all teachers have an opportunity to find something they enjoy doing. Participation is not mandatory—they are a willing group!"

12. Does decisionmaking routinely involve your entire faculty? Yes or no. If yes, in what types of decisions is the entire faculty involved?

Analysis of the data across levels (elementary, middle, and high school) and within groups (administrator and teacher) shows that administrators more than teachers believe that the entire faculty is routinely involved in school decisions.

Involvement of the entire faculty seemed to vary around two factors: size of the school and importance of the decision to each teacher. For example, many respondents described staff representative structures such as the principal's advisory team, administrative council, advisory board school improvement team, and department and grade level committees. Where respondents provided descriptions of the decisionmaking processes at their schools, the data show that many committees send memoranda to the entire staff asking for response to issues and/or add the recommendation of a committee to the agenda of a general faculty meeting. A review of all responses points toward infrequent involvement, or involvement on an as-needed basis, of entire faculties in school decisionmaking.

Decisions reported that involved the entire faculties of schools responding included a range of concerns from gum chewing to the school budget. Most frequently mentioned decisions were school goals, budgets, discipline policies, parent involvement, and general school rules. Continuing education sessions, curriculum, duty assignments, and student recognition were also

decisions into which all teachers in an exemplary school might have input. One principal respondent described a method of "deciding about deciding" which operates at his school:

> When a policy or procedure is being reviewed, the faculty indicates whether or not they want to: (1) be involved in making the decision, (2) have an opportunity to react to the decision, or (3) be informed of the decision. This process gives every person the choice as to his or her level of involvement.

13. In your opinion, do decisions made on school policies and practices represent the majority of staff opinions? Please explain.

Eighty percent of the respondents felt that decisions made on school policies and practices represented the majority of staff opinions. Both teachers and administrators, represented approximately equally among respondents, stated that seeking faculty input and involvement through committee structures or total faculty meetings ensured that the majority of the faculty agreed with decisions made. Consensus reaching and voting were the methods most often cited as the means for representing total faculty opinions in final decisions. Two factors described as contributing to general support for decisions were a shared school philosophy and open communications to ensure opportunities for input on most decisions.

Negative responses were reported for each of the three questions in this section. Teachers and administrators described schools with no structures for teacher involvement in decisions or few opportunities for equal input to decisions made. However, while teacher involvement in decisionmaking is not essential for selection as a West Virginia exemplary school, respondents from the schools represented indicate that it is a common and perhaps contributing factor.

Obstacles Participants Perceive to Participatory Decisionmaking in Their Schools or Obstacles Overcome

Question 14 of the survey deals with this concern. It was felt that this information would assist educators who are considering the establishment of participatory decisionmaking in their schools or who are currently struggling with the process. The survey question is included below for reference.

14. What obstacles do you perceive to participatory decisionmaking in your school? If administrators and teachers in your school overcame obstacles to achieve participatory decisionmaking, what were they?

One obstacle was evident in almost all survey responses—time. Time for adequate training of staff; time to meet with colleagues to develop school programs, philosophies, or teaching strategies; and time to consider and reconsider programs before implementing them were all in short supply. Even the time it takes to convince colleagues, administrators, and school boards that change takes time and is necessary was mentioned as lacking.

Respondents mentioned a variety of other obstacles to participatory decisionmaking. Lack of communication among teachers or between teachers and administrators was the second most frequently mentioned obstacle to participatory decisionmaking. Some respondents reported that in their schools too few teachers had or, in some cases, wanted involvement in school decisions. In other schools, teachers and principals reported a necessary movement of thinking from the "I" (impact on self) to the "we" (impact on students) the faculty and principal had to achieve before progress could be made. The shift

in control of decisions from the principal and/or a small group of teachers to the entire faculty through consensus reaching or majority voting was also described as an obstacle by several respondents. Finally, mentioned by a few respondents was the lack of school-based decisionmaking opportunities when, according to most respondents, decisions are made by the district board of education, the state board of education, the legislature, and/or federal regulations.

The following section compares findings of the "WVEA-AEL Survey of Educator Perceptions of Decisionmaking in West Virginia Exemplary Schools" with those of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching reported in *Teacher Involvement in Decisionmaking: A State-by-State Profile* (1988). This final section also illustrates the relationship between participatory decisionmaking and West Virginia exemplary school status.

Comparison of Results from the WVEA-AEL Survey and Results From Teacher Involvement in Decisionmaking: A State-by-State Profile

In September 1988 the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching published the results of a national survey of teacher perceptions regarding their involvement in deciding policy and practice within their schools. *Teacher Involvement in Decisionmaking: A State-by-State Profile* (1988) was based on a survey that asked ten questions related to teacher decisionmaking. The more than 20,000 responses from 50 states were weighted to represent a true proportion of elementary and secondary teachers within each state.

In concluding an investigation of the "WVEA-AEL Survey of Educator Perceptions of Decisionmaking in West Virginia Exemplary Schools," a comparison of the WVEA-AEL survey results with the Carnegie survey is appropriate. Although the same questions were not asked, teacher responses from the WVEA-AEL survey pertaining to areas of involvement in participatory decisionmaking (see Appendix B, Question 6) relate closely to the Carnegie survey. Twenty-four teacher respondents were among the 52 respondents to the WVEA-AEL survey. Based on the questions from the Carnegie survey, teacher responses to related questions on the WVEA-AEL survey are compared with the responses of the national and West Virginia samples in the Carnegie survey.

A variety of topics are covered in the following subsections. Survey response data relate to instructional materials, curriculum, student behavior, tracking, inservice training, promotion policy, budget, teacher evaluation, and selection of teachers and administrators.

Instructional Materials

Carnegie. When asked whether they were involved in decisions pertaining to the choice of textbooks and instructional materials, 79 percent of the respondents answered affirmatively. Sixty-seven percent of the West Virginia sample believed that they were involved in decisions of this nature.

WVEA-AEL. Of the West Virginia exemplary schools sample, 96 percent indicated that they had a part in decisions regarding instructional materials.

Curriculum

Carnegie. When asked whether they were involved in decisions that shaped the curriculum in their schools, 63 percent of the national sample gave an affirmative response. Forty-three percent of the West Virginia sample felt they were involved in decisions regarding this issue.

WVEA-AEL. Of the West Virginia exemplary schools sample, 76 percent indicated that they had a part in decisions regarding curriculum.

Student Behavior

Carnegie. When asked whether they were

involved in decisions that set standards for student behavior, 47 percent of the national sample answered affirmatively. Fifty-two percent of the teachers in the West Virginia sample felt they were involved in decisions of this type.

WVEA-AEL. Of the West Virginia exemplary schools sample, 76 percent reported involvement in decisions involving student discipline policy.

Tracking

Carnegie. When asked whether they were involved in deciding whether students are tracked into special classes, 45 percent of the national sample answered affirmatively. Thirty-nine percent of the West Virginia sample felt they were involved in decisions regarding this issue.

WVEA-AEL. Of the West Virginia exemplary schools sample, 80 percent indicated that they were involved in decisions regarding student placement.

Inservice Training

Carnegie. When asked whether they were involved in designing staff development and inservice programs, 43 percent of the teachers nationally and 38 percent of the West Virginia teachers indicated involvement of some type.

WVEA-AEL. Of the West Virginia exemplary schools sample, 80 percent indicated that they were involved in decisions regarding inservice training.

Promotion Policy

Carnegie. Thirty-four percent of the national sample felt that they were involved in setting promotion and retention policies, wh..e 27 percent of the West Virginia sample felt they were involved in decisions regarding this issue.

WVEA-AEL. Of the West Virginia exemplary schools sample, 80 percent indicated that they were involved in decisions regarding grading and student evaluation.

Budget

Carnegie. In matters of deciding school budgets, 20 percent of the national sample reported involvment, as compared to 12 percent of the West Virginia sample.

WVEA-AEL. Thirty-six percent of the West Virginia exemplary schools sample reported involvement in decisions of budget.

Teacher Evaluation

Carnegie. When asked whether they were involved in evaluating teacher performance, 10 percent of the national sample answered affirmatively. Eleven percent of the West Virginia sample felt they were involved in decisions of this type.

WVEA-AEL. Of the West Virginia exemplary schools sample, 44 percent indicated that they were involved in decisions regarding teacher evaluation; however, one respondent answered affirmatively on the basis of involvement in his or her own evaluation. Therefore, there is some question whether other respondents were referring to the evaluation of their peers or of themselves exclusively.

Teacher Selection

Carnegie. Only seven percent of the national sample and four percent of the West Virginia sample reported involvement in the selection of new teachers.

WVEA-AEL. Twenty-four percent of teachers from West Virginia exemplary schools indicated involvement in decisions regarding staff selection.

Administrator Selection

Carnegie. Few teachers, both nationally (seven percent) and in West Virginia (two percent), indicated involvement in the selection of new administrators.

WVEA-AEL. No teacher respondents reported involvement in decisions regarding the selection of principals.

When the scores of the West Virginia respondents to the Carnegie survey are compared with the national sample, responses vary considerably. For eight of the ten questions asked, fewer respondents from the West Virginia sample than the national sample felt involved in issues regarding school decisionmaking. One surprising discrepancy, of 20 percentage points, between the WVEA-AEL survey results and those of the Carnegie study was in the West Virginia teachers' perception of their lack of involvement in decisions that shape curriculum. On all other questions, the difference in percentages fell within a range of 12 percentage points.

When the items on the WVEA-AEL survey of teachers from exemplary schools are compared both with the national and West Virginia samples of the Carnegie survey, percentages were considerably higher for the WVEA-AEL sample with one exception. On the issue of teacher involvement in the selection of new administrators, no respondent in the WVEA-AEL survey indicated involvement. However, the percentages for the national and West Virginia Carnegie samples were seven percent and two percent, respectively, indicating very little involvement.

Although the WVEA-AEL sample responses averaged more than 25 percentage points above the national and West Virginia samples of the Carnegie survey on all issues, the greatest discrepancies were found in three questions in particular. For items exploring perceived levels of involvement in issues of tracking into special classes, designing staff development and in-service programs, and setting promotion and retention policies, the WVEA-AEL sample averaged at least 40 percentage points above the national and West Virginia samples of the Carnegie study.

Even though any conclusions from comparing responses of the two surveys must be tentative, it is clear that teachers of West Virginia exemplary schools perceive themselves to be highly involved in decisionmaking within their schools. This is apparent although the selection of exemplary schools by the West Virginia Department of Education does not require evidence of participatory decisionmaking.

Conclusion

Maeroff (1988) contends that tapping the professional expertise of teachers in achieving school excellence can be achieved through teacher empowerment. Further, he states that teacher empowerment must begin with a new appreciation of teachers as professionals:

> If teachers can be lifted in three key areas—each of which complements the others—they will be able to flex muscles that have been allowed to atrophy. Those three areas involve their status, their knowledge, and their access to decisionmaking. (p. 473)

Teachers responding to the WVEA-AEL survey indicated a greater access to decision-making than their national and state counterparts seem to enjoy. It appears that, in the process of achieving exemplary school status, the faculties of these schools embraced collaborative decisionmaking strategies. The degree to which their perceptions and responses were influenced by their employment in exemplary schools or instead to their access to decisionmaking is impossible to determine. The striking result of these factors, however, may be professionals who approach their work with the confidence and dignity that comes from exercising control over their work and working conditions.

References

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1988). *Report card on school reform: The teachers speak*. Princeton, NJ: Author.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1988). *Teacher involvement in decisionmaking: A state-by-state profile*. Princeton, NJ: Author.

Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. Hyattsville, MD: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Kelley, S. (1986, December). A new approach to school decision-making. *Virginia Journal of Education, 80*(4), 17-18.

Maeroff, G. (1988, March). A blueprint for empowering teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69*(7), 472-477.

Marburger, C. (1985). *One school at a time. School-based management: A process for change*. Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Mojkowski, C., & Fleming, D. (1988, May). *School-site management: Concepts and approaches*. Cranston, RI: Rhode Island Leadership Academy.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Schneider, G. (1984). Teacher involvement in decisionmaking: Zones of acceptance, decision conditions, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 18*(1), 25-32.

The Source. (1989, May 24). Summary of the report, *Report card on school reform: The teachers speak*, issued by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Ed-Line News Database. Arlington, VA: National School Public Relations Association.

West Virginia Department of Education. (1988, August). *Information packet: 1988-89 West Virginia Exemplary Schools Program and National School Recognition Program*. Charleston, WV: Author.

Bibliography

Participatory/School-Based Decisionmaking

Alutto, J., & Belasco, J. (1972). A typology for participation in organizational decision-making. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 17*(1), 117-125.

Ariav, T. (1985, March). *Collaborative school-based curriculum development: A case study.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 257 707)

Bacharach, S., & Conely, S. (1986, May). Education reform: A managerial agenda. *Phi Delta Kappan, 67*(9), 641-645.

Barth, S. (1988, May). Principals, teachers, and school leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69*(4), 639.

Bentley, E., Jr., & Campbell, B. (1986, November). *Transition strategies at the school level: Reforming middle grades' organization and programs.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Regional Council for Educational Administration, Atlanta, GA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 276 153)

Berliner, D. C. (1984). The half-full glass: A review of research on teaching. In P. L. Hosford (Ed.), *Using what we know about teaching* (pp. 51-77). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Bird, T. (1986). *The mentor's dilemma: Prospects and demands of the California mentor teacher program.* San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Boyd, B. (1986, April). Collaborative decision-making in local development of school policy and practices. *In a state in action: Working with schools for program improvement.* Symposium presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Bridges, E. (1967). A model for shared decision-making in the school principalship. *Educational Administrative Quarterly, 3*(1), 49-61.

Brown University. (1988). *Coalition of essential schools: Prospectus 1984 to 1994.* Providence, RI: Education Department.

California Commission on the Teaching Profession. (1985, November). *Who will teach our children?* Sacramento, CA: Author.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1988, September). *Teacher involvement in decisionmaking: A state-by-state profile.* Princeton, N.J.: Author.

Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century.* Hyattsville, MD: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Casner-Lotto, J. (1988, January). Expanding the teacher's role: Hammond's school improvement process. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69*(5), 349-353.

Cawelti, G. (1989, January). Will site-based management improve productivity? *ASCD Update, 31*(1). 2.

Chase, L. (1983, February). Quality circles in education. *Educational Leadership, 40*(5), 19-26.

Clune, W., & White, P. (1988, September). *School-based management: Institutional variation, implementation, and issues for further research.* (Research Report Series RR-008). Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education.

Cohen, M. (1988). *Restructuring the educational system: Agenda for the 1990s.* Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.

Conley, S., Schmidle, T., & Shedd, J. (1988, Winter). Teacher participation in the management of school systems. *Teachers College Record, 90*(2), 259-280.

Conway, J. (1976). Test of linearity between teachers' participation in decision making and their perceptions of their schools as organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 21,* 130-139.

Cowsill, J. (1987). *School-based management: An overview.* Paper commissioned by Rhode Island Educational Leadership Academy, Cranston, RI.

Cox, P. (1983, November). Complementary roles in successful change. *Educational Leadership, 41*(3).

Crandall, D., & Associates. (1982). *People, policies and practices: Examining the chain of school improvement.* Andover, MA: The NETWORK, Inc.

Davis, W., & Frank, F. (1979). *The relationship between the perceived level of decisional participation of secondary school teachers and their job satisfaction: A discrepancy approach.* Madison, WI: Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Individualized Schooling.

Dawson, J., & D'Amico, J. (1985, April). Involving program staff in evaluation studies: A strategy for increasing information use and enriching the data base. *Evaluation Review, 9*(2), 173-88.

Devlin, B. (1981). Democratic leadership: Guidelines for school administrators. *Administrator's Notebook, 24*(4).

Duke, A. (1982). *Winning words.* Boston, MA: CBI Publishing Company.

Duke, D., Showers, B., & Imber, M. (1980). Teachers and shared decisionmaking: The costs and benefits of involvement. *Educational Administrative Quarterly, 16*(1), 93-106.

Duluth Public Schools, Minnesota. (1987, February 20). *Participatory management: Key to success.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 281 274)

Edwards, C. 1988. *Team approach to better schools: Infopak.* Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Empowerment: Helping people take charge. (1988, January). *Training, 25*(1), 63-64.

Expanding the leadership team. (1988, February). *Educational Leadership, 45*(5), 4-8.

Feir, R. (1985, April). *The structure of school: Teachers and authority.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 257 806)

Fisher, R., & Ury, W. (1981). *Getting to yes.* New York: Penguin Books.

Fleming, D. (1989). *A curriculum for shared leadership.* Andover, MA: Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands.

Fleming, D. (1984). *An information user's checklist.* Chelmsford, MA: Northeast Regional Exchange, Inc.

Fleming, D. (1987). *Instructional supervision: A review of issues and current practices.* Cranston, RI: Rhode Isl. nd Educational Leadership Academy.

Foley, R. (1985). *McREL peer support groups.* Kansas City, MO: Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory.

Francis, D., & Young, D. (1979). Stages of team development. *Improving work groups.* San Diego, CA: University Associates, Inc., pp. 152-153.

Fulbright, L. (Ed.) (1988). *School-based management: A strategy for better learning.* Alexandria, VA: American Association of School Administrators, National Association of Elementary School Principals, and National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Fullan, M. (1982). *The meaning of educational change.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Furman, G. (1986, April). *School district approval for staff development: "Garbage can" decision-making.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 271 871)

Gordon, T. (1980). *Leadership effectiveness training.* New York: Bantam Books.

Gough, P. B., & Smith, B. M. (Eds.). (1988, March). A blueprint for empowering teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69*(7).

Gray, W. & Gray, M. (1985, November). Synthesis of research on mentoring beginning teachers. *Educational Leadership, 43*(3), 37-43.

Hall, G., & Hord, S. (1987). *Change in schools: Facilitating the process.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Hamilton, D. (1988). *Resident supervisory support for teachers training manual.* Washington, DC: Banneker Academic High School.

Hansen, B. J., & Marburger, C. L. (1988). *School based improvement: A manual for district leaders.* Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Harris, L. (1986). The American teacher 1986. *Restructuring the teaching profession, the metropolitan life survey.* New York: Harris and Associates, Inc.

Hawley, D. (1985, November). The quality circle concept. *Principal, 65*(2), 41-43.

Herrick, N. (1985, Fall). Is the time really ripe for educational democracy? *Social Policy, 16*(2), 53-56.

Hersey, P., & Natemeyer, W. (1982). *Problem-solving decision-making style inventory.* Escondido, CA: Center for Leadership Studies.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *Motivation to work.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Johnston, G., & Germinario, V. (1985, Winter). Relationship between teacher decisional status and loyalty. *Journal of Educational Administration, 23*(1), 91-105.

Jones, J., & Bearley, W. (1988). *The empowerment profile.* King of Prussia, PA: Organization Design and Development.

Kantor, R. (1983). *The change masters.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Katzell, R., & Yankelovich, D. (1975). *Work, productivity and job satisfaction.* New York: Psychological Corporation, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Kindler, H. (1988). *Managing disagreement constructively.* Los Altos, CA: CRISP Publications.

Koppich, J., et al. (1985, Autumn). Keeping the teachers we have. *Teacher Educational Quarterly, 12*(4), 55-64.

Knight, P. (1985, January-March). The practice of school-based curriculum development. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 17*(1), 37-48.

Landsmann, L. (1988, January). Ten resolutions for teachers; some hints for teachers on how to make school reform come alive. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69*(2), 373.

Lawrence, D. (1985, May). The Toledo plan for peer evaluation and assistance. *Education and Urban Society, 17*(3), 347-51.

Levin, H. (1987). *Finance and governance implications of school-based decisions.* Draft version prepared for the Work In America Institute, Inc., Scarsdale, NY.

Levine, S. L. (1989). *Promoting adult growth in schools.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Lewis, J. (1986). *Achieving excellence in our schools...by taking lessons from America's best run companies.* Westbury, NY: Wilkerson Publishing Companies.

Lewis, J., Jr. (1989). *Implementing school-based management...by empowering teachers.* Westbury, NY: National Clearinghouse on School-Based Management.

Lieberman, A. (1988, February). Expanding the leadership team. *Educational Leadership, 45*(4), 4-8.

Lieberman, A. (1988, May). Teachers and principals: Turf, tension, and new tasks. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69*(6), 648.

Lieberman, M. (1985, Spring). Faculty self-government: The triumphs of the academic mystique. *Government Union Review, 6*(2), 40-54.

Lightfoot, S. (1983). *The good high school.* New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Lindelow, J. (1981). School-based management. In S. Smith, J. Mozarella, & P. Piele (Eds.), *School leadership: Handbook for survival* (pp. 94-129). Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Lindelow, J. (1981). Team Management. In S. Smith, J. Mozarella, & P. Piele (Eds.), *School leadership: Handbook for survival.* (pp. 130-149). Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Lindelow, J., Coursen, D. & Mazzarella, J. (1981). Participative decisionmaking. In S. Smith, J. Mozarella, & P. Piele (Eds.), *School leadership: Handbook for survival* (pp. 150-168). Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Lipham, J. (1974). Making effective decisions. In J. A. Culbertson, C. Henson, and R. Morrison (Eds.), *Performance objectives for school principals.* Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Littky, D., & Fried, R. (1988, January). The challenge to make good schools great. *NEA Today, 6*(6), 4-8.

Loucks-Horsley, S. et al. (1987). *Continuing to learn: A guidebook for teacher development.* Andover, MA: Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands.

Loucks-Horsley, S., & Hergert, L. F. (1985). *An action guide to school improvement.* Andover, MA: The NETWORK, Inc.

Maeroff, G. (1988, March). A blueprint for empowering teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69*(7), 472-477.

Maeroff, G. (1988). *The Empowerment of Teachers, Overcoming the Crisis of Confidence.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Malanowski, R., Kachris, P., & Kenney, V. (1986, April 20). *Professional analysis teams in schools: A case study.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 280 135)

Malen, B., & Ogawa, R. (1985, August). *The implementation of the Salt Lake City School District's shared governance policy: A study of school-site councils.* Prepared for the Salt Lake City School District, UT. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 274 099)

Marburger, C. (1985). *One school at a time.* School based management: A process for change. Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

McCarthy, R. (1985, May). Technology, time, and participation: How a principal supports teachers. *Education and Urban Society, 17*(3), 324-31.

McMahon, D. (1987, February 20). *Getting to yes.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 280 188)

Mertens, S., & Yarger, S. (1988, January-February). Teaching as a profession: Leadership, empowerment, and involvement. *Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(1), 32-37.

Miles, M. (1981). *Learning to work in groups.* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Miller, R. (1987). *Team planning for educational leaders.* Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools, Inc.

Moeser, E., & Golen, L. (1987, April). *Participative management: A labor management process that works for kids.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National School Boards Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 281 275)

Mohrman, A., Jr., Cooke, R., & Mohrman, S. (1978). Participation in decision making: A multidimensional perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 14*(1), 13-19.

National Education Association. (1984). *An Open Letter to America: On Schools, Students, and Tomorrow.* Washington, DC: National Education Association.

National Education Association-Mastery In Learning, (1988). *IBM/NEA Mastery in Learning Project school renewal network.* Unpublished manuscript.

National Education Association-Mastery in Learning. (1986). *NEA Mastery in Learning Project: Prospectus.* Unpublished manuscript.

National Governors' Association. (1986). *Time for results: The governors' 1991 report on education.* Washington, DC: Author.

National School Public Relations Association. (1989). *School based management: A communication workshop kit.* Arlington, VA: Author.

Nicholson, J. (1987, August). School-based decision-making in Stamford, CT. *The Developer, 1,* 4-6.

Obermeyer, G. (1987). *A report on the status of school-based decision-making.* Draft version prepared for the National Education Association, Mastery in Learning Project, Washington, DC.

Olson, L. (1986, March 19). Teachers seek decisionmaking power. *Education Week,* p. 4.

Pajak, E., & Glickman, C. (1987, March). *Dimensions of improving school districts.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 281 313)

Patterson, J. L., Purkey, S. C., & Parker, J. V. (1986). *Productive school systems for a nonrational world.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Performax Systems International. (1982). *Activity perception profile.* Minneapolis, MN: Author.

Peters, T., & Waterman, R. (1982). *In search of excellence.* New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Pierce, L. (1977). *School site management.* Occasional Paper. Cambridge, MA: Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies Program in Education for a Changing Society.

Powell, R., & Schlacter, I. (1971). Participative management: A panacea? *Academy of Management Journal, 14,* 165-173.

Public Education Information Network. (1985). Equity and excellence: Toward an agenda for school reform. *Education for a democratic future.* St. Louis, MO: Public Education Information Network.

Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands. (1987). *Guide to developing a comprehensive assessment procedure for your district.* Andover, MA: Author.

Renner, P. (1983). *The instructor's survival kit.* Training Associates Ltd. Vancouver BC, Canada, pp. 103-104.

Rennie, R. (1985, April). School centered management: A matter of style. *School Business Affairs, 51*(4), 64-65, 67.

Saber, N. (1985, October-December). School-based curriculum development: Reflections from an international seminar. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 17*(4), 52-54.

Salganik, L. (1985, March). *Schools under pressure: The external environment and recent organizational reforms.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 265 636)

Sange-Walters, P., et al. (1987, February). *Total school intervention programs: A state initiative to improve staff development through organization development.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 279 089)

Sarason, S., et al. (1971). *The culture of school and the problem of change.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Sarason, S., et al. (1985, November). Fulfilling the promise: A fresh look at collaboration and resource sharing in education. *Pathways to growth.* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Schlechty, P., et al. (1985, December-January). The Charlotte-Mecklenburg teacher career development program. *Educational Leadership, 42*(4), 4-8.

Schmuck, R., & Runkel, P. (1985). *Handbook of organization development in schools.* (3rd ed.) Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Schneider, G. (1984). Teacher involvement in decision making: Zones of acceptance, decision conditions, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 18*(1), 25-32.

Schools oust principals. (1987, September). *Communicator, 11*(1), 1.

Seashore, S., & Bowers, D. (1963). *Changing the structure and functioning of an organization.* Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan State Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Shedd, J., et al. (1986, April 20). *Teachers as decisionmakers.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 280 132)

Sickler, J. (1988, January). Teachers in charge: Empowering the professionals. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69*(5), 354-375.

Sizer, T. (1984). *Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Slavin, R. (1978). *Using student team learning.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools.

Smith, S. (1986). *New structures build collaboration among teachers and administrators.* Eugene, OR: Oregon School Study Council.

Smith, S., et al. (Eds.) (1981). *School leadership: Handbook for survival.* Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 209 736)

Sorenson, L. (1985, April). *Decision making of public school superintendents: The involvement of subordinates and others.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 265 615)

Sopris West Incorporated. (1989). *Educational programs that work.* Longmont, CO: Author.

Speed, N. (1979). *Decision participation and staff satisfaction in middle and junior high schools that individualize instruction* (Technical Report No. 521). Madison, WI: Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Individualized Schooling.

State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. (1987, August). Restructuring schools through school-site management. In *To improve education in Rhode Island by the year 1991: Recommendations of Governor Edward D. Diprete's 1991 Task Force,* (pp. 12-13). Providence, RI: Author.

Stokes, S. (Ed.). (1981). *School-based staff support teams.* Bloomington, IN: National Inservice Network, Indiana University.

Streich, W. (1986, April). *Public school curriculum improvement through participatory evaluation.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 274 080)

The NETWORK, Inc. (1979). *General assessment of project health.* Andover, MA: Author.

Turner, E. (1985). *Intelitec program planning guide.* White Plains, NY: Intelitec Management Systems, Inc.

Virginia Education Association, Virginia Association of Elementary School Principals, & Appalachia Educational Laboratory. (1987). *Participatory decisionmaking: Working models in Virginia elementary schools.* Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory.

Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and motivation.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Weick, K., & Campbell, J. (1970). *Managerial behavior, performance, and effectiveness.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Welsh, P. (1987, Spring). Are administrators ready to share decision making with teachers? *American Educator, 11*(1), 23, 25, 47-48.

White, P. (1988, September). *Resource materials on school-based management.* (Research Report Series RR-009). Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education.

Who's in charge here? (1987, April). *NEA Today,* p. 10.

Zerchykov, R. (1985, Fall). Why school councils? *Equity and Choice, 2*(1), 37-38.

Appendices

Appendix A

WVEA-AEL Survey of Educator Perceptions of Decisionmaking in West Virginia Exemplary Schools

Survey Respondents

WVEA-AEL Survey of Educator Perceptions of Decisionmaking in West Virginia Exemplary Schools

Respondents

Elementary Schools	District
Cross Lanes Elementary James Brannon	Kanawha County Schools
Franklin Primary William C. Harvey	Brooke County Schools
Anna Jarvis Elementary Debra Spadafore Rebecca Weaver	Taylor County Schools
Jayenne School Bonnie Moats	Marion County Schools
Jennings Randolph Elementary Vince Delconte 20 teachers in collaboration	Randolph County Schools
Mineral Wells Elementary Bruce Goody anonymous teacher	Wood County Schools
Montrose Elementary Lon Mitchell Judy Morris	Kanawha County Schools
North Elementary Susanne C. Newbrough	Monongalia County Schools
Opequon Elementary Wendell Roberson Isabelle Seibert	Berkeley County Schools
Page Jackson Solar Elementary John Ritchey	Jefferson County Schools
Ritchie Elementary Pamela Wampler	Ohio County Schools
Scott Teays Elementary Dwight Childers	Putnam County Schools

Second Ward Elementary Stephanie Evans Stephan B. King JoAnn Lorensen	Monongalia County Schools
Warwood Elementary Kay Faulner	Ohio County Schools
Weberwood Elementary Charlotte Richardson	Kanawha County Schools
West Milford Elementary Frank Devono	Harrison County Schools
Wyatt Elementary Ben Guido Richard Kitzmiller	Harrison County Schools

Middle or Junior High Schools	**District**
Bridgeport Junior High William Fahey	Harrison County Schools
Hayes Junior High Rebecca Goodwin	Kanawha County Schools
Keyser Primary-Middle Wayne Arnold	Mineral County Schools
Pleasants County Middle Randy Nutter	Pleasants County Schools
Ravenswood Middle Danny Hunter	Jackson County Schools
Ripley Middle Charles Cottrill	Jackson County Schools
Salem Junior High Phyllis Pilewski	Harrison County Schools
Sutton Middle Elizabeth Silitch	Braxton County Schools
Triadelphia Junior High Clifford Bowers	Ohio County Schools
Warwood Junior High James Monderine	Ohio County Schools

Wellsburg Middle Carol Churchman Curtis Tarr	Brooke County Schools
Winfield Middle Jeff Wymer	Putnam County Schools

High Schools	**District**
Huntington High Charles Barnett	Cabell County Schools
Nitro Senior High Norma King	Kanawha County Schools
Pineville High Raymond Rose	Wyoming County Schools
Ravenswood High Phyllis Fox	Jackson County Schools
Ripley High Jack Wiseman	Jackson County Schools
St. Marys High Cynthia Alkire Glen DeHaven	Pleasants County Schools
Sistersville High Joe Griffith	Tyler County Schools
George Washington High Larry Lohan	Kanawha County Schools
Wheeling Park High Alice King George Krelis David Weyrauch	Ohio County Schools

One teacher responded anonymously, indicating neither school nor district.

Appendix B

WVEA-AEL Survey of Educator Perceptions of Decisionmaking in West Virginia Exemplary Schools

and

Invitation to Participate

Memorandum

November 29, 1988

TO: Principals and Selected Teachers of West Virginia Exemplary Schools

FROM: WVEA-AEL Study Group on Participatory Decisionmaking

SUBJECT: Your Invitation to Participate in a Study and Publication of Findings

Congratulations to you and your colleagues on your school's selection within the last six years as an Exemplary School of West Virginia! We know your efforts to sustain excellence in instruction continue. We are interested in learning if teachers participate in the decisionmaking in your school and if that participation was a factor in your school's excellence award. We don't hold a specific definition of participatory decisionmaking, but it is often referred to as "collegial management" or "shared decisionmaking."

The West Virginia Education Association and the Appalachia Educational Laboratory jointly sponsor study groups of teachers and administrators each year. Group members examine one educational issue and produce a product useful to educators from their findings. Our study group is reviewing literature related to participatory decisionmaking and has developed a survey to assess teacher and administrator perceptions of decisionmaking in their schools.

As the principal or an experienced teacher of an exemplary school, you are invited to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the stampled envelope provided. All survey responses will be grouped for analysis, and all information will be used confidentially. Should you agree to participate, your school will receive a copy of the study group's publication of findings. This product will be available through WVEA in West Virginia and publicized and provided at cost to educators in Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia by AEL.

The 20 minutes the survey may require will be well spent as a contribution to the knowledge base on participatory decisionmaking in exemplary schools. Those educators wishing to model their schools on your example will learn the various types of decisionmaking processes that might assist them.

If you have any questions about the questionnaire, please contact Jane Hange, Appalachia Educational Laboratory, at 800/344-6646 or 347-0411 (Charleston area). Thank you for completing the questionnaire and sharing some of the secrets of your success!

WVEA-AEL

Survey of Educator Perceptions of Decisionmaking in West Virginia Exemplary Schools

Please carefully consider the following questions as they relate to decisionmaking by educators in your school, and write your responses or check appropriate items.

1. In your view, why is your school an exemplary school? What characteristics of your school make it exemplary?	
2. Is teacher participation in decisionmaking an important part of decisions made at your school?	
3. Do you believe teachers in your school have input (are asked to share their opinions directly or through a faculty representative) into establishing the school goals? Yes or no. If yes, please explain in more detail, citing examples.	
4. Do you believe teachers in your school have input into policy revisions or the formulation of new policies (e.g., attendance, student discipline, professional leave, or parental involvement policies)? Yes or no. If yes, please describe any recent decisions regarding policy into which teachers had input.	

12/88

5. Do you believe teachers have input into day-to-day school practice decisions (e.g., student placement, grouping, or scheduling practices)? Yes or no. If yes, please describe any teacher input into recent practice decisions.

6. Please check any area listed in which you believe teachers make decisions or have regular input into decisions at your school.

___ curriculum
___ scheduling
___ grouping
___ duty assignment
___ student placement
___ ad hoc committee formation
___ ad hoc committee member selection
___ discipline policy
___ absence/truancy policy
___ released time use
___ extracurricular responsibilities (coaching, club advisement)
___ student recognition (academic and sports)
___ instructional materials selection
___ school budget allocations
___ teacher evaluation
___ staff selection
___ principal selection
___ department chairperson/team leader/grade rep selection
___ grading/student evaluation
___ report card/progress report development
___ inservice training
___ job descriptions
___ other

_____
(Please describe.)

7. In what areas not mentioned in items 3, 4, 5, and 6 (above) would teachers in your school like to have input or involvement in decisionmaking?

8. Do you believe teachers have adequate input into decisions made at your school?

9. Is there time during the school day for mutual planning by departments, grade levels, or ad hoc committees of educators? Yes or no. If yes, please describe any specific examples.	
10. About what percent of the teachers in your school volunteer to serve on school committees?	
11. Has district or school-based training been offered for faculty in any of the following areas? Please check any and all that apply.	___ participatory decisionmaking ___ communications ___ conflict resolution ___ brainstorming ___ problem identification ___ data collection, needs assessment ___ trust building ___ school climate improvement ___ consensus reaching ___ school leadership _____ other (Please describe.)
12. Does decisionmaking routinely involve your entire faculty? Yes or no. If yes, in what types of decisions is the entire faculty involved?	

13. In your opinion, do decisions made on school policies and practices represent the majority of staff opinions? Please explain.	
14. What obstacles do you perceive to participatory decisionmaking in your school? If administrators and teachers in your school overcame obstacles to achieve participatory decisionmaking, what were they?	
15. Do you believe that participatory decisionmaking is used at your school? Yes or no. If yes, please explain what you believe are the main benefits from your school's participatory decisionmaking.	

Thank you for completing and returning this questionnaire in the enclosed envelope by December 16, 1988. Should it be necessary to contact you for a brief telephone interview to describe programs at your school, we would appreciate your providing a phone number where you can be reached at school or in the evening.

Name _____

School _____

Address _____

_____

School or Home (circle one) Phone Number _____

Appendix C

Areas of Teacher Involvement in Decisions

Percentage of Teachers and Principals Checking Each Area

WVEA-AEL Survey of Educator Perceptions of Decisionmaking in West Virginia Exemplary Schools

6. Please check any area listed in which you believe teachers make decisions or have regular input into decisions at your school.

___ curriculum
___ scheduling
___ grouping
___ duty assignment
___ student placement
___ ad hoc committee formation
___ ad hoc committee member selection
___ discipline policy
___ absence/truancy policy
___ released time use
___ extracurricular responsibilities (coaching, club advisement)
___ student recognition (academic and sports)
___ instructional materials selection
___ school budget allocations
___ teacher evaluation
___ staff selection
___ principal selection
___ department chairperson/team leader/grade rep selection
___ grading/student evaluation
___ report card/progress report development
___ inservice training
___ job descriptions
___ other

(Please describe.)

Areas of Teacher Involvement in Decisions	Percentages of Respondents Checking Each Area	
	Total Teachers	Total Principals
Curriculum	72	100
Scheduling	64	96
Grouping	84	92
Duty assignment	60	53
Student placement	80	88
Adhoc committee formation	60	73
Adhoc committee member selection	52	73
Discipline policy	76	88
Absence/truancy policy	44	65
Released time use	28	26
Extracurricular responsibilities	20	69
Student recognition	92	96
Instructional material selection	92	96
School budget allocations	40	69
Teacher evaluation	48	57
Staff selection	24	38
Principal selection	0	8
Departmen chairperson/team leader grade rep selection	44	42
Grading/student evaluation	68	92
Report card/progress report development	80	80
Inservice training	80	73
Job descriptions	20	26
Other	0	0